



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,033	12/11/2003	Cary J. Hoffer	200312174-1	8421
22879	7590	04/17/2008	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION			2614	
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/17/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/733,033	HOFFER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Melur Ramakrishnaiah	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 15 recites among other things: wherein the camera is in a power off state when enclosed inside the computer in the first position and automatically transitions to a power on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position inside the computer to the second position being mechanically detached from the computer. There is no support for this: especially automatically transitions to a power on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position inside the computer to the second position being mechanically detached from the computer. Once it is mechanically detached, power cannot be supplied by the power source in the computer. According to applicants specification, power is supplied to the camera from rechargeable batteries (paragraph: 0039) when it is mechanically detached from the computer and it is nothing to do with automatically transitioning to a power on state as claimed by the applicant.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi et al. (US PAT: 6,525,932, filed 8-16-2000, hereinafter Ohnishi) in view of Yamane (US PAT: 6,285,833).

Regarding claim 1, Ohnishi discloses a portable computer, comprising: a base portion with a keyboard (40, fig. 1, 4-8), an electronic display (12, fig. 1) connected to the base portion, and a camera (420, figs. 4-9, col. 17, line 13 – col. 18, line 12) stored in the base portion (this reads on expansion unit 200, fig. 1 and 400 figs. 6-9 which includes camera being stored in the expansion bay slot in base (20, fig. 1) of a portable computer when not in use (col. 11 lines 39-40; col. 17 lines 7-12, col. 18 lines 30-35)).

Ohnishi differs from claims 1-2 in that he does not specifically teach the following: camera automatically powers on as the camera is ejected from the base portion, and camera automatically powers off when inserted into the base portion.

However, Yamane discloses camera which teaches the following: flash unit (4, figs. 1-2) automatically powers on when ejected from the base portion, flash unit automatically powers off when inserted into the base portion (col. 3 lines 21-41; col. 4 lines 43-56; col. 5 lines 7-34)).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Ohnishi's system to provide for the following: camera automatically powers on when ejected from the base portion, and camera automatically powers off when inserted into the base portion as this arrangement would facilitate to conserve power usage by turning on power to the device on/off depending upon its usage condition as taught by Yamane.

Regarding claim 3, Ohnishi teaches the following: elongated mounting member (430, fig. 9) connected to the camera (420, col. 17 lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 4, Ohnishi teaches the following: mounting member has a cylindrical shape and provides electrical communication between the camera and the base portion (col. 17 lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 5, Ohnishi teaches the following: mounting member that mechanically and electrically couples the camera to the base portion (col. 17 lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 6, Ohnishi teaches the following: one end of the camera (420, fig. 9) is connected to a mounting member, the camera being movable about two different axes as indicated by arrows A and B in fig. 9 while connected to the mounting member (col. 17, line 66 – col. 18, line 12).

Regarding claims 7-8, Ohnishi teaches the following: base portion (20, fig. 1) comprises a cavity and camera is mounted inside the cavity (this reads on expansion unit 200, fig. 1 and 400 figs. 6-9 which includes camera being stored in the expansion

bay slot in base (20, fig. 1) when not in use and cavity is formed in a side of the base portion (20, fig. 1; col. 11 lines 39-40; col. 17 lines 7-12, col. 18 lines 30-35).

Regarding claim 9, Ohnishi teaches the following: the camera (420, figs. 4-9) is movable between a storage portion inside the base portion (20, fig. 1, this reads on expansion unit 200, fig. 1 and 400 figs. 6-9 which includes camera being stored in the expansion bay slot in base 20, fig. 1; fig. 1; col. 11 lines 39-40; col. 17 lines 7-12, col. 18 lines 30-35) and ejected position (fig. 9) disposed outside of the base portion, the camera being mechanically connected to the portable computer while in the ejected portion, the camera is movable about two different axes as indicated by arrows A and B in fig. 9 while in the ejected position (figs. 4, 7-9).

Ohnishi differs from claims 11-12 in that he does not specifically teach the following: activating a switch located inside the computer while ejecting the camera from the computer to perform the automatically powering the camera on, activating the switch located inside the computer while inserting the camera into the computer to perform the automatically powering the camera off.

However, Yamane teaches the following: activating a switch (17, fig. 4) located inside the electronic device (1, figs. 1-2) while ejecting the flash unit (4, figs. 1-2, 4) from the electronic device to perform the automatically powering the flash unit on, activating the switch located inside the electronic device (1, figs. 1-2) while inserting the flash unit into the electronic device to perform the automatically powering the flash unit off (col. 4, line 43 – col. 5, line 34).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Ohnishi's system to provide for the following: activating a switch located inside the computer while ejecting the camera from the computer to perform the automatically powering the camera on, activating the switch located inside the computer while inserting the camera into the computer to perform the automatically powering the camera off as this arrangement would facilitate to conserve power usage by turning on power to the device on/off depending upon its usage condition as taught by Yamane.

Regarding claim 13, Ohnishi further teaches the following: inserting the camera (420, figs. 6-9) into a cavity in the computer (100, figs. 6-8) so an outer surface of the camera forms an exterior surface of the computer (this reads on expansion unit 200, fig. 1 and 400 figs. 6-9 which includes camera being stored in the expansion bay slot in base (20, fig. 1) when not in use, col. 11 lines 39-40; col. 17 lines 7-12, col. 18 lines 30-35).

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane as applied to claims 1, 9 above, and further in view of Boyden et al. (US 2003/0112325 A1, hereinafter Boyden).

The combination differs from claim 14 in that it does not teach the following: removing the camera from mechanical attachment to the computer, and transmitting wireless signals from the camera to the computer.

However, Boyden discloses camera positioning system which teaches the following: wireless transmitter (440, fig. 4) wirelessly transmitting camera signals to a wireless receiver (432) for further use (paragraph: 0079).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: removing the camera from mechanical attachment to the computer, and transmitting wireless signals from the camera to the computer as this arrangement would provide one of the methods, among many possible methods, for transmitting signals between the devices as taught by Boyden.

4. Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cipolla et al. (US PAT: 6,587,151, hereinafter Cipolla) in view of Murata et al. (US PAT: 5,691,766, hereinafter Murata).

Regarding claim 15, Cipolla discloses video conference system (col. 1 lines 34-38), comprising: a computer (11, fig. 9), and a camera movable between a first position (stored position, fig. 10) and second position (usable position, fig. 9), wherein the camera is enclosed in the computer in the first position (fig. 10) and is ejected to be mechanically detached from the computer in the second position (fig. 9), the camera being electrically coupled to the computer in the second position (fig. 9; col. 5, lines 49-66; col. 6 lines 11-50)

Cipolla differs from claimed invention in that although it would be inherent to keep the camera in power off state when in stored position as shown in fig. 10 in order not to waste electrical power and turn on power to camera when it is removed from the stored

state to use state when it is mechanically detached as shown in fig. 9, he does not specifically teach: camera is in a power-off state when enclosed in a computer in the first position and automatically transitions to a power on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position in the computer to the second position.

However, Murata teaches the following: camera light is in a power-off state when enclosed in a camera device in the first position and automatically transitions to a power on state as the camera light is ejected from the stowed position (fig. 9, col. 4 lines 25-38).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Cipolla's system to provide for the following: camera is in a power-off state when enclosed in a computer in the first position and automatically transitions to a power on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position in the computer to the second position as this arrangement would provide the most obvious solution to conserve electrical power when the devices are not in use as taught by Murata.

Regarding claims 16, Cipolla further teaches the following: camera (1, fig. 10) has a housing that is completely disposed in the first position such that housing forms an exterior surface of the computer as shown fig. 10.

Regarding claims 18-19, Cipolla further teaches the following : computer (11, fig. 9) comprises a mounting member (57, fig. 10), wherein the mounting member is disposed inside the computer in the first position and extends outwardly from the

computer in the second position, camera is mechanically connected to the mounting member while in the first position (fig. 10, col. 5, lines 49-66; col. 6 lines 11-50)

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cipolla) in view of Murata as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Boyden.

The combination differs from claim 17 in that it does not teach the following: camera transmits wireless signals to the computer while in the second position.

However, Boyden discloses camera positioning system which teaches the following: wireless transmitter (440, fig. 4) wirelessly transmitting camera signals to a wireless receiver (432) for further use (paragraph: 0079).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: camera transmits wireless signals to the computer while in the second position as this arrangement would provide one of the methods, among many possible methods, for transmitting signals between the devices as taught by Boyden.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane.

Regarding claim 10, Ohnishi teaches a method, comprising: ejecting the camera from inside the cavity located in a computer (100, figs. 1, 4-9) and inserting the camera into the cavity of the computer (this reads on expansion unit 200, fig. 1 and 400 figs. 6-9 which includes camera being stored in the expansion bay slot in base 20, fig. 1; col. 11 lines 39-40; col. 17 lines 7-12, col. 18 lines 30-35)

Ohnishi differs from claim 10 in that it does not teach the following: automatically powering a camera on/or off depending upon whether the camera is ejected/or inserted from/or in computer.

However, Yamane teaches the following: automatically powering a flash unit (4, figs. 1-4) on/or off depending upon whether the flash unit is ejected/or inserted from/or in electronic device (1, fig. 1, col. 4, line 43 – col. 5, line 34).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Ohnishi's system to provide for the following: automatically powering a camera on/or off depending upon whether the camera is ejected/or inserted from/or in computer as this arrangement would facilitate to conserve power usage by turning on power to the device on/off depending upon its usage condition as taught by Yamane.

***Response to Argument***

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 1-21-2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ohnishi et al. (US PAT: 6,525,932, filed 8-16-2000, hereinafter Ohnishi) in view of Yamane (US PAT: 6,285,833): regarding rejection of claims, for example independent claim 1, Applicant argues that "independent claim 1 recites that camera automatically power on as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the portable computer. The examiner admits that Ohnishi does not teach this element. Applicant agrees ... The Examiner, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with Ohnishi.

Yamane teaches a camera ... when the switch is operated, the main power of the camera is turns on. In contrast to Yamane, claim 1 recites that the camera is automatically powers on "as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the computer". The camera in Yamane is not ejected from a base portion of a portable computer. Power to the camera is not activated upon ejection of the camera, power to the camera is activated when pop-up flash on the camera is pushed". Regarding this, as stated in the office action, Yamane teaches an arrangement where a device such as strobe flash unit is automatically powered on when ejected from the base portion and automatically powered off when in the base portion (col. 3 lines 21-41; col. 4 lines 43-56; col. 5 lines 7-34). After all application specification in paragraph [0025] of its publication states: a variety of switches or switch technologies used to automatically power the camera on when it is ejected and automatically power off camera when it is stored. So in view of this, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made would be able to modify Ohnishi's system which teaches ejecting camera when in use and storing it in computer when not in use to automatically power on/off camera depending upon its position using teachings of Yamane which teaches switches to automatically power on/off of a device (col. 5 lines 32-34) such as a strobe flash unit depredating upon whether it is ejected or not from the device body in order to control power to the device so that power is applied when it is ready to be used and power off when not in use or in stored position.

Regarding rejection of independent claim 10, Applicant makes similar arguments as in independent claim 1. Response made therein is also applicable to independent claim 10.

Applicants arguments regarding amended claims 15-19 are moot in view of new rejection as set forth above.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melur Ramakrishnaiah/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614